

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/9516.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference No. 137 of 1980

between
SHRI SHER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARDA OIL UDYOG,
BYPASS, HODEL

Present:—None for the Workman.
None for the Management.

AWARD

The reference No. 137 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/15-80/9873, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Sher Singh, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Sher Singh was justified and in order ? If-not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference, notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent-management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel, which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited upto 1-30 p.m. So I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

Dated, the 1st August, 1980.

I.P. CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1277, dated the 4th August, 1980

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/9517.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 133 of 1980

between
SHRI THAKAR LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARDA OIL UDYOG,
BYPASS, HODEL

Present.—None for the Workman.
None for the Management.

AWARD

The reference No. 133 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/115-80/9879, dated the 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Thakar Lal, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Thakar Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent-management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities ‘refused’. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel, which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, Bypass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited upto 1-30 P.M. So I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government, to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

Dated the 1st August, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1276, dated the 4th August, 1980

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/9518.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 135 of 1980

between

SHRI HET RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARDA OIL UDYOG,
BYPASS, HODEL

Present:— None for the Workman.
None for the Management.

AWARD

The reference No. 135 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/15-80/9891, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Het Ram, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, Bypass, Hodel. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Het Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

After receiving this reference, notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By pass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s Sarda Udyog, By pass, Hodel, which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s Sarda Udyog, By Pass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, By pass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited upto 1-30 p.m. So I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government, to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By pass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

Dated, the 1st August, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1275, dated the 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/9519.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By pass, Hodel: —

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 134 of 1980
between

SHRI PADAM WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARDA OIL UDYOG,
BYPASS, HODEL

Present: — None for the Workman.
None for the Management.

AWARD

The reference No. 134 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/15-80/9885, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Padam, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By pass, Hodel. The term of the reference was:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Padam was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

After receiving this reference, notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By pass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s. Sarda Oil Udyog By pass, Hodel, which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s Sarda Udyog, By pass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, By pass, Hodel now. It was also told that the where abouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited up to 1-30 P.M. So I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government, to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

Dated the 1st August, 1980

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1274, dated the 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (Four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad,

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/9520.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, (1947) Act No. XIV of 1947, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 132 of 1980

between

SHRI HARI SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s. SARDA OIL
UDYOD, BY PASS, HOD L.

Present :

None, for the Workman.

None, for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 132 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/15-80, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Hari Singh, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Singh was justified and in order? If no, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this Court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s Sarda Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel, which has since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s. Sardas Udyog, By Pass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, By Pass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited up to 1.30 p.m. so I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the

Government to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

The 1st August, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1273, dated 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary, to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab/9521.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 131 of 1980

between

SHRI SUKHI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARD A OIL UDYOG, BY PASS,
HODEL

Present:

None, for the Workman.

None, for the Management.

AWARD

This reference No. 131 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/15-80/9903, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Sukhi, workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sukhi was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent-management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notice on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s Sarda Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s Sarda Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s Sarda Udyog, By-Pass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited up to 1.30 p.m. So

I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

The 1st August, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1272, dated the 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (Four copies), to the Secretary, to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/9522. —In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I. P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 103 of 1980

between

SHRI JAI NARAIN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SARDA OIL UDYOG,
BY PASS, HODEL

Present.—

None, for the Workman.

None, for the Management.

AWARD

The reference No. 103 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, — vide his order No. ID/FD/15-80-9861, dated 25th February, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Jai Narain workman and the management of M/s Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Narain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties to appear on 27th May, 1980 at Hodel in Municipal Office. The notice to the respondent-management was sent through Regd. A.D. cover for the above date but the same was returned to this office with the remarks of the postal authorities 'refused'. Then on 27th May, 1980 when I visited Hodel, I ordered the Peon of my court to serve the notices on the management personally. The Peon of this court reported that when he went to give the notices, the factory was found closed and it was told to him by the adjoining Dall factory that there was no factory under the name and style as M/s. Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. The name of the factory was told to be M/s. Sarda Udyog, By Pass, Hodel which had since been closed. This building was taken on rent by M/s. Sarda Udyog, By Pass, Hodel and there was nothing of M/s. Sarda Udyog, By Pass, Hodel now. It was also told that the whereabouts of the respondent were not known.

On the other hand none appeared from the side of the workman also. In these circumstances, I was left with no choice except to proceed with the case in absence of both the parties. I waited upto 1.30 P.M. So I feel that the workman is not interested in pursuing this reference, although this reference has been sent by the Government to this court for adjudication. It seems that the workman is not appearing in this reference because he has come to know about his mistake of raising the demand against a respondent whose name he has not correctly mentioned. Therefore, I feel that there is no dispute left between this workman and the respondent whose name and style is M/s. Sarda Oil Udyog, By Pass, Hodel. Therefore, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer of this reference.

I.P. CHAUDHRY,

Dated the 1st August, 1980.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1271, dated 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (Four copies), to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHRY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3 Lab./9523.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Vishal Private Ltd., Plot No. 49, D.L.F., Industrial Estate, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI I.P. CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 61 of 1980

between

SHRI SIRI BHAGWAN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. VISHAL PRIVATE LTD., PLOT NO. 49, D.L.F. INDUSTRIAL ESTATES, FARIDABAD

Present .—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workman.

Shri K.P. Aggarwal, for the respondent.

AWARD

This reference No. 61 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/274-79/7520, dated 8th February, 1980 under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Siri Bhagwan and the management of M/s. Vishal Private Ltd., Plot No. 49, D.L.F., Industrial Estate, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Siri Bhagwan was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving the order of reference, notices were issued to both the parties. Both the parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties following issues were framed :—

1. Whether the workman absented from the duty of the management and it is a case of abandonment of service by the workman ? If so, to what effect (O.P.M.)
2. Whether the workman joined duty after his abandonment of this service of his own accord and worked for 15 days on fresh letter of appointment and again absented from duty after working for 15 days. If so, to what effect ? (O.P.M.)
3. Whether the termination of services of the workman is proper and justified ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?
4. Relief.

First and second issues were treated as preliminary issue and the case was fixed for recording of evidence of the parties, but on 22nd July, 1980, the representative of the management made a statement that the workman had received Rs 130.60 P. in full and final settlement of all his claim, after submitting his resignation to the management. The photo copy of the resignation is Ex. M-2 and voucher of full and final is Ex. M-1. Now nothing remains due to the workman. This statement of the representative of the management was agreed to by the representative of the workman. The representative of the workman who further stated that he had no instruction from the workman to pursue this reference.

In the light of the above statement made by both the parties I hold that the demand raised by the workman against the management leading to this reference has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated between the parties.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated 4th August, 1980.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1268, dated 4th August, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act with the request that receipt of award may please be acknowledged within a week's time.

I. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

The 18th August, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-3L1) 9742.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Harkalyan Packages, Murthal.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference No. 213 of 1979

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARKALYAN PACKAGES,
MURTHAL

Present -

Srv Shri Bhagat Ram, Tilak Ram and Raj Kumar, for the workmen.

Shri Zile Singh, for the management.

AWARD

1. By order No. SPE/133-78/34311, dated 3rd August, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Harkalyan Packages, Murthal (Sonepari) and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus for the year 1977-78 ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen should be given appointment letter ? If so, with what details ?
3. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of annual increment at Rs 30 per month ? If so, with what details ?

4. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of House Rent allowance ? If so, with what details ?
5. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of cycle allowance ? If so, with what details ?
6. Whether the workmen should be supplied with attendance cards ? If so, with what details ?
7. Whether the workmen should be supplied with uniforms ? If so, with what details ?
8. Whether the workmen should be catered ? If so, with what details ?
9. Whether the workmen should be given Gur and Nimboo to neutralise the effect of dust ? If so, with what details ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. On the last date of hearing the workmen stated that the disputes have been settled with the management mutually and all the demands of this reference have been settled and the workmen are not interested in proceeding with the reference. While answering the reference, I give my award that the dispute has been settled between the parties and there is no dispute now pending for adjudication between the parties.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated 4th August, 1980.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 722, dated 6th August, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 27th August, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/9946.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Max-on-Product, Khandsa Road, Gurgaon.—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 271 of 1979

between

SHRI PIAREY LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MAX-ON-PRODUCT,
KHANDSA ROAD, GURGAON

Present—

Shri S. K. Yadav, for the workman.

Shri K. C. Khanna, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. GG/36-79/38/81, dated 31st August, 1979, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Max-on-Product, Khandsa Road, Gurgaon, and its workman Shri Piarey Lal, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Piarey Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed on 10th December, 1979, and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management took many adjournments for adducing their evidence. On 26th July, 1980, the representative for the workman stated that the workman has settled the dispute with the management. The settlement is Ex. W-1 and the workman has received a sum of Rs. 1,000 in full and final settlement. I, therefore, give my award that the workman has settled the dispute with the management and has received a sum of Rs. 1,000 in full and final settlement and there is no dispute pending for adjudication.

Dated the 18th August, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 753, dated 21st August, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-3Lab/9947.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Robindra Textile Mills, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 109 of 1978

between

SHRI SUKHVIR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ROBINDRA
TEXTILE MILLS, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:

Shri P. N. De for the workman.
Shri D. C. Bhardwaj for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/17223, dated 4th May, 1978 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Robindra Textile Mills, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Sukhvir Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sukhvir Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 17th August, 1978 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. On the last date of hearing the representative for the management stated that the workman had received Rs. 1400.74 in full and final settlement and had tendered his resignation. In the circumstances, I give award that the workman has settled the dispute with the management and has received a sum Rs. 1,400.74 from the management in full and final settlement and there is no dispute now pending for adjudication.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 18th August, 1980.

No. 747, dated the 21st August, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.